



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tary properties in common with all created things, and must retain their immutable and intransitive character, independent of any external agency. Besides this metaphysical argument, we find the same substantial identity after the sacerdotal action as before. We have a metaphysical certainty arising from the nature of things, that no subject can exist without its peculiar and distinctive properties. The evidence of our senses establishes the same identity after the ministerial agency; and, to crown all, the omniscience of God confirms both, as He knew that the nature of created things could not be altered; and, consequently, he must have spoken figuratively. What weight can the Council of Trent have when placed in juxtaposition with the above proofs? Yet, in her 13th session, she pronounces an entire conversion of the elementary properties of bread and wine.

Perhaps it will be objected to me that He who created the heavens and the earth—the fixed stars with their concomitant planets, all things visible and invisible, who changed the rod of Moses into a serpent, who changed Lot's wife into a pillar of salt, who changed the river of Egypt into blood, and the water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana—could change the elementary properties of bread and wine into his own body and blood, by a miraculous interposition. To this I answer, that a miracle is a suspension of the natural law to promote a moral advantage. All these miraculous changes were intuitively, and by immediate perception, *apparent to the senses of every person present*, and reason bowed in affirmation to their decision. But, in the case of Transubstantiation, there must be not only a suspension of the natural law but an entire subversion of the fundamental principles of physics—an entire prostration of the senses, with marks of no confidence stamped upon their creation. But in order to have a parallel case with Transubstantiation, the wine, at the wedding feast, should still have retained, after its conversion, the colour and taste of water, together with all its pure and elementary properties, instead of satisfying, as it did, the combined energies of the senses of all who witnessed it, that a real change had taken place, from actual water into actual wine, with all the qualities of taste, colour, and smell naturally incident to it.

From these proofs, taken from the sacred Scripture, it must appear evident that there was but *one* propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of mankind, and that was the sacrifice of Calvary. That there was no sacrifice at the last supper appears from the same proofs, and that no change has, or could be effected by the sacerdotal action, so as to transubstantiate a particle of dough into the God of the universe.

How melancholy, then, is the reflection, that so many, who profess the religion of Rome, run on from the cradle to the tomb without inquiring if they are following the religion of Christ and him crucified, or without ever opening the Bible—the great charter of man's salvation, which, in every page, points out the way to eternal life. How true to life was that remark of Addison, which says—"If you tell the same story to a man for several years consecutively he will believe it to be true in the end." This observation is confirmed by the conduct of the followers of Rome, who hear their priests say, every week, that the mass is a continuation of the sacrifice of the cross, and that the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ, without ever inquiring into the truth of this doctrine, which is entirely refuted by the teaching of the New Scripture.

If we compare the worship of Roman Catholics of the present day, though to them the light of revelation has been made known, even with the simple, yet sublime, homage of the uneducated Indians of Peru, what a melancholy contrast! They worshipped the sun—the parent of life and vegetation, of time and seasons, of all things visible, yet unapproachable. What more solid foundation to build *natural* religion upon? A perpetual fire burned on the altar of the Indians. What a beautiful representation of their divinity! This sun worship seems to have been widely spread, and was known to the Phenicians, Chaldeans, Babylonians, and even to the Irish people in their natural state. A fractional remnant of this untaught religion may even still be seen in this island, when fires are lit when the sun is at its highest altitude at the summer solstice. Possibly this adoration of the Indian was only secondary, but at any rate it was the sublime poetry—the dignified and refined religion—of nature's uneducated children. Place this pure, sublime, and æthereal homage of uneducated Pagans in contrast with that of modern Roman Catholics, and how great is the difference? The former adored the parent of life, the latter a particle of dough. As rational and accountable beings, I shudder for the consequences. Idolatry though unconscious is still idolatry. If Transubstantiation be an error, as I have demonstrated it to be, what must be the guilt of those in the sight of God, who, in spite of both their reason and their senses, persist in practising a mimic and idolatrous adoration.

(To be Continued.)

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXVI.

"Them's hard times, Jem," said Pat.
 "That's true anyway, Pat," said Jem; "it's not easy keeping the meal to the children these times. But sure we have a right to be thankful it's no worse."
 "Well, Jem," said Pat, "I heard Mr. Nulty talking

of that, and he allowed that if the crops was short this year, it's the famine we would have back again; so we have a right to be thankful sure enough."

"And it's the poor thing, too, that the Rooshians with their fighting, should stint the childer of the meal," said Jem; "I wonder will it soon be over."

"Well, I heard Mr. Nulty allow it wouldn't," said Pat; "and he allowed there would be mighty heavy taxes on the farmers and the gentlemen to pay for it; so you see all gets their pinch by it as well as we."

"Well, it's not bad times yet with the farmers," said Jem; "they're pretty snug for a while anyway. But I suppose they will get their turn of the pinch too."

"Well, most all comes in for it by turns," said Pat; "but there's some getting the pinch sore enough these years back, that there isn't much said of."

"And who would that be?" said Jem.
 "Why it's the priests, Jem," said Pat; "sure it's they got the pinch in earnest in the famine times, and hasn't come round yet like the farmers."

"Well," said Jem, "I don't think times is hard on Father John, and sure there's Father Peter, the curate, and Father Brady of the next parish, and enough more of them, that keeps their hunters as fine as ever."

"Well, there's some of them not much the worse," said Pat; "but even Father John hasn't near what he had; and there's a deal of the priests that got it sore in the famine times, and that isn't much better yet; you see, Jem, where the farms is good, and the farmers strong, the priest gets his share now as well as ever; but where the priests were depending to the little man, it went to the bad with them entirely. Sure the poor people can't pay them now the way they used; and there isn't the marrying and the christening there used to be; and there's a deal of places where the poor people itself isn't in it; and what can the priest do there? and where there's large Protestant grazing farms, and the poor people's houses down, sure the priest may go starve."

"Well, it's the poor thing, sure enough," said Jem, "for them that was bred to be clargy, and had such a rule in the country, to come to that. Sure they can't do without it no more nor ourselves, and they're not used to it; and it doesn't come natural to clargy, the way it does to the like of us. Sure I would be sorry for Father John himself, if he was at a dis-short; but it makes again them greatly when some of them keeps their hunters, and goes a skeiving across the country after the hounds; 'deed I thought many a time it would be no worse for them if they would take after the Protestant clergy in that. But what becomes of them at all where they gets nothing?"

"Well, I heard a deal about that, when I was down at the fairs in Connaught," said Pat. "I was talking to the men that driv up the cattle from the out-of-the-way places, and they allowed there wasn't half the priests in it there used to be; and them that was there had little enough to live on; and maybe it's getting less was the little."

"And where are the priests that's not in it?" said Jem.
 "Why, there's some in America, and some in Australia," said Pat.

"Well, sure if they follow the people, won't they do as well as ever?" said Jem.

"They won't, Jem," said Pat; "by all accounts the people isn't the same in America as they is here. Don't you mind Father Mullen's letter that we read in the newspaper* that made it out that two millions of the Irish had turned in America. Sure it isn't them the priests can live by. You see, Jem, America is a kind of place where every man does what he likes."

"Well, I wonder why people doesn't do what they like in Ireland, as well as in America," said Jem; "but, sure enough, they don't; what's the reason at all?"

"Well, I had a talk about that, with a man that drove up the sheep that Mr. Nulty bought at Ballinasloe," said Pat; "he was a mighty cute sensible man; and we fell into talk, and I asked him that very same; and says he, 'do you mind them sheep,' says he; 'now, while you keep them together on the road, where the one goes, they'll all go,' says he, 'and you'll just have no trouble at all; but, if you won't let them get one in one field, and another in another field, why, then, every sheep goes after its own nose, and no two goes the same way; and its the more they'll scatter,' says he, 'and the harder on you to gather them; and that's the way with men, too,' says he; 'keep them together, and they'll go the one way; but, once they scatter, then every man goes the way he likes, and no man thinks no more about what every body does; so you mind the sheep and keep them all together,' says he."

"And will the Irish people go the one way for ever in Ireland, without minding the way they would like to go?" said Jem.

"Why, man alive," said Pat, "don't you see yourself, if a bully of a sheep just makes a bolt at the hedge, all the rest goes bolt after him too; and sure it's in the field they will be in spite of you. Sure it's in the field they would all like to be; and, when the bully goes, won't they be after him?"

"Aye," said Jem, "I see that surely; but where will we get the right sort of bully in Ireland? Sure it's sheep we are, but there isn't the bullies in it."

So Pat looked Jem right hard in the face, as if he was going to be the bully to make the bolt himself—only he wasn't. So said Pat, looking as hard as he could, "Jem, it's a right bully of a priest I would like to see, of the right sort; and wouldn't he have the following?"

"And what would you have him to do, at all?" said Jem.

So Pat looked harder at Jem than ever; and he said, with a fire that seemed to be dancing in his eye, "Jem, as I'm a living man, there's a something afore us in Ireland; and a priest, with THE BIBLE in his hand, is what Ireland wants."

"And would you have him to turn, and have the bishop on his back?" said Jem.

"I don't want him to turn neither backward nor forward," said Pat, "but to hold up the Douay Bible in his hand, and to call on the Irish people; that's the man that Ireland's waiting for, and that's the man for the following; and it isn't the bishop on his back he need think about, for it's Ireland he will have at his back."

"And would he be a Protestant all out, Pat?" said Jem.

"Well, that isn't so easy seen, Jem," said Pat. "You see, if a man quits the Mass, and goes to Church, he changes his name plain enough; but, if a priest only stands up in the chapel, and holds up a Douay Bible in his hand, and says, 'Boys, it's the Word of God that is able to save our souls,' it isn't so easy seen if that makes them all Protestants. Anyway, it's not as plain as a man walking, by himself alone, out of the chapel into the church."

"Aye, but where would that stop, Pat?" said Jem.

"It wouldn't stop short of the Word of God, Jem," said Pat; "and why should it; and who could say again it. Who could stop it, at all? Neither crook nor crozier, if that bolt was made by the right bully. Wouldn't all Ireland turn round to the priest with the Bible in his hand?"

"And will the like of that ever be, Pat?" said Jem.

"Jem," said Pat, "there has been trouble from God in Ireland. His hand done it. There was trouble on the people, and trouble on the priest. And it's not for nothing. The hearts of the people is stirred, like what they never was before; and there seems to be something that the hearts of the people wants; and it can't be nothing but the Word that comes from God. There's a something afore us; and it's THE MAN we're waiting on."

Time will tell if Pat has rightly comprehended the feeling of poor men like himself. And, perhaps, "the man," when he comes, may look back to the words of Pat.

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.

No. IV.

WE have been obliged by press of other matter, so long to postpone the following paper, that it may be necessary to remind our readers, that we have already shown in former numbers,* that so far from the celibacy of the clergy having always prevailed in Ireland, for many centuries of our history, ecclesiastical benefices descended in this Island of Saints from one member of a family to another (often from father to son or grandson), much in the same way, as did secular landed property, according to the old Irish law or custom, known by the name of *Tanistry*.

We showed, that from A.D. 753 to A.D. 1134, the same custom prevailed through 12 generations at Clonmacnoise, that it also prevailed for a period of 300 years in the churches of Lusk, Monasterboice, Iona, Derry, Kildara, Armagh, and many others.

We concluded our last paper, by noticing the strange contrast between the accounts given of the death of Murrough, A.D. 1134, by the Irish Annalists, the Four Masters, and St. Bernard, in his life of Malachy.

According to the former, "Murrough, successor of St. Patrick, died penitent—yea, triumphant." According to the latter, "Murrough—no bishop but a tyrant, an ecclesiastical adulterer, went from this world to be damned; yet still, to live in an heir, provided for the purpose of adding to his deeds of damnation!"

The quiet remark of the very learned Father Colgan, on this curious difference between St. Bernard and the Irish Annalists, is to the following effect:—"St. Bernard," says he, (speaking of Primate Niall), "is more severe on this individual than are our native Annals;" which Dr. O'Donovan quotes in his "Annals of the Four Masters" (A.D. 1139, p. 1062, note b.) as "a very appropriate remark." We do not however, think it so. It would not appear to us at all an appropriate remark to say, "Dr. MacHale is more severe on the Achill Scripture-readers than the Protestant clergy are." It would rather seem a stupid remark, and likely to have come from some one who did not understand the matter, or know how to represent it fairly; because the Protestant clergy are not at all severe on the readers, but countenance and favour them. So neither are the Irish Annalists anywhere, or in anyway, severe on Primate Niall or his family, any more than on their opponent Maelmogue and his helpers. On the contrary, they speak of them as they do of all the good and pious men whom they notice generally, and mention their deaths as those of any

* We gave extracts from this letter in our number for September, 1852, vol. i., p. 103.

* See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii. pp. 51, 87; vol. iii., pp. 33, 48.

other ordinary ecclesiastical persons, whether the earlier successors of St. Patrick, or any other of the ancient worthies of the Irish Church.

Father Colgan, on the other hand (although, perhaps, not having looked into the facts brought forward in these papers in their full connection, and in the accurate way in which we have endeavoured to present them to the reader), appears to have been sorely perplexed and distressed at the evidence furnished in the "Annals," of the fact that the old Irish clergy, including those of the highest rank and eminence among them—culdees, bishops, abbots, &c.—were commonly married men, and in so far nothing different from those reforming bishops and clergymen (Geo. Browne, of Dublin, &c.), who, in the time of Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole, were branded as adulterers, and put out of their Sees, for having married wives, according to the permission of the Lord by his holy Apostles. Father Colgan, therefore, labours with much ado to confuse what is in itself so plain and intelligible; seeking, if possible, to dissipate the force of the evidence in question. In order to enable the reader to see what so learned a person, of such views, is able to make of the case, it will be best to let Colgan speak for himself; and we shall, accordingly, for this purpose, set forth here his statement of the matter, though rather a long one, in full, as follows:—

"As to what he (i.e., St. Bernard) says concerning the hereditary usurpation of that See (i.e., Armagh) for some fifteen generations, provided it be rightly understood, I regard it as being either wholly true, or very near the truth, and can show this to be the case. For by a *generation*, he doth not (as some erroneously understand it,) mean the age of one man, nor even the space of twenty years, much less a full century (seeing that Christianity itself was not so old as that in Bernard's day), but either the succession of one bishop to another of the same family (for, as I shall demonstrate presently, we find fifteen such generations or successions of bishops of one family, actually on record); or, at least, by a *generation* he understands the age at which the period of generating begins, which is, in men, that of fourteen years—as is to be inferred from his own adding immediately after, '*who had now for about 200 years kept possession of the sanctuary of God.*' Therefore, by some *fifteen generations* he means only about 200 years. And that such a sort of hereditary succession did continue for so many years, or more, is to me evident from two reasons—

"First, Because the aspect of the Irish Church, which, from the year of Christ 440, to about the year 840, had been in a most flourishing condition, and, for so long, second to no other in Europe, began gradually to alter for the worse, for the course of some 200 years then following, during which, in engagements, fightings, and conflicts—not of annual, but almost monthly, and, at times, of daily occurrence—was spent the period of that unceasing warfare between the Irish and the ferocious, and then dominant, race of the Normans—i.e., the Norwegians and the Danes, and other adjacent clans—who, not content with their own vast extent of territory, conquered and subjugated England, Scotland, and the rest of the British Isles, and some of the maritime districts of Gaul, burning and destroying with pagan fury the dwellings of clergy and laity, their churches and cities, and occupying for themselves certain ports and maritime towns. These tedious disasters having reached their close, and the Normans having been beaten and slaughtered in the battle of Clontarf in the year 1013, another trouble succeeded, which was no less ruinous to the whole country and its Church's discipline and religion. The princes of the realm, engaging in quarrels relative to the chief supremacy, which occasioned constant battling from the year 1013 to 1105, and subsequently, Church discipline and religious influences received so severe a shock as well nigh annihilated them; until, at length, in that year, 1105, St. Celsus having been created Archbishop of Armagh, did his utmost for the restoring of piety from her exile, and discipline from the neglect into which she had fallen. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at, if, in such disastrous times, some powerful family, especially the one which had bestowed various lands on the erection and endowment of the See of Armagh, made an effort to have prelates of their own tribe appointed to that See, and in this way to possess, as if by hereditary right, the sanctuary of God.

"The second argument which I promised above, not only establishes the credibility of that hereditary succession of prelates in the same family, but even seems to demonstrate the fact of its having really existed. For (as it appears from what has been already said in this Chronological Catalogue), from the year 925 (in which, on the death of St. Maelbride, son of Torman, Joseph succeeded as Bishop of Armagh,) to the year 1129, (in which St. Celsus, the last of them, died,) fifteen bishops of the same family are found to have succeeded one another for the space of about 200 years, as is clearly evident from the following catalogue of them, according to the order of their succession, and the years in which, respectively, they died:—

"Maelpatrick, son of Maeltila, died the same year (925), having sat for nine months.

"Casey, son of Alcheus, died A.D. 946.

"Murray deposed, and Dudalehe, son of Kellach, substituted in his stead, an. 965.

"Murechan occupies the See, an. 993.

"Maelmury, son of Scanlan, died 994.

"Maelmury, son of Hoey, 1020.

"Awley, 1049.

"Dudalehe, son of Maelmury, 1064.

"Cumuscach, 1075.

"Melisa, son of Awley, 1091.

"Donald, son of Awley, 1105.

"S. Celsus, son of Hugh, son of Melisa, died an. 1129.

"Now, from these entries we deduce that fifteen bishops of the same family did, for the space of about 200 years, retain possession, as by hereditary right, of the See of Armagh, as S. Bernard states. For from that powerful family was descended S. Celsus himself, who, happily degenerating from the unprincipled custom of his kindred, alienated the sanctuary of God from his own family to S. Malachy: for he was grandson to Melisa, Prelate of Armagh (by his son Hugh), of whom above, as is inferred from the remarks already made at A.D. 1105. It appears further, from the same entries, taken in connection with what else has been said above in this catalogue, that the statement is either true, or nearly true, which is contained in the words of S. Bernard afore-cited—viz., that *there were eight before Celsus* (i.e., styled Prelates of Armagh) *who were married men, and without orders, but, however, men of education.* For of these eight married and unordained persons were Murechan, father of Murray, Prior of Armagh, of whom above, at A.D. 986; Maelmury, son of Hoey, father of Dudalehe, another bishop of Armagh, of whom above, at A.D. 1064; Dudalehe himself, father to Hugh, Archdeacon [rather vice-erenach] of Armagh, of whom above, at A.D. 1108; Awley, father to Melisa and Donald, Prelates of Armagh, of whom [we have spoken] at A.D. 1091, 1105; Melisa, father to Flannagan, of whom at A.D. 1114; Donald, father of that pseudo-bishop [Murtogh, or] Maurice, who, supported by the secular power, thrust himself into the place of Celsus, according to what we shall state presently. The other three appear to have been, Murray, 965; Dudalehe II., son of Kellach, who was substituted in Murray's place; and Cumuscach, who died in the year 1075.

"Hence, then, arose all that relaxation of Church discipline, powerlessness of censures, and annihilation of religion, above complained of by S. Bernard. Yet were there, in the time of these pseudo-bishops, others legitimately ordained, who, acting as their suffragans, did perform episcopal offices in the diocese of Armagh—as Casey, son of Murchadan, who died A.D. 966; Arvey, son of Cosgry, 1006; Maelmury, son of Hoey, A.D. 1020; Maeltila, 1032; Hugh Ua Forrey, 1056; and Ken-corach, who died A.D. 1106.

"But you will say *first*, that some of the aforesaid persons enumerated by us among the married prelates, are described as having closed a laudable career by distinguished penitence; as Dudalehe the 2nd, who died June 2, A.D. 968; Dudalehe the 3rd, September 1, 1064; Melisa, December 20, 1091; Donald, son of Awley, who died August 2, A.D. 1105; and that they ought not, therefore, to be reckoned among the pseudo-bishops, or married men. I answer, that this inference doth not hold; for even Murtogh (who, after having seen S. Malachy elected before himself, according to the will of S. Celsus, and by the votes of the clergy and laity, still thrust himself, by the aid of the secular power, into the same See) is described afterwards as having ended his days in laudable penitence. And why should not Christian men, observing the sins and errors of their past life, have recourse to laudable penance at its close?

"You will say, *secondly*, that Prelate Awley administered the sacrament of Extreme Unction to Malachy, King of Ireland, when dying, in the year 1022; and that he, therefore, should not be enumerated among the married men.

"I answer, that we nowhere read of Awley's having administered the sacrament of Extreme Unction to King Malachy; but only that King Malachy was anointed in his hands. But that Awley begat two sons—viz., Melisa and Donald, who were afterwards numbered among the prelates of Armagh, is a matter evident enough from what is aforesaid. We must rather, therefore, class him with the married and unordained prelates, of whom S. Bernard speaks, than suppose him, contrary to the dignity of his position, and all right views of his order, to have begotten children by adultery and sacrilege. And seeing that, even in the present day, when ecclesiastical discipline is more strictly enforced than it has been for many ages past, we may observe in Germany, and various other countries of Europe, many persons numbered among the bishops, archbishops, and even cardinals, who have never been admitted to the sacred orders corresponding to such office, who can wonder, that in those ages of turbulence, amid so many tempests of wars, many should come to be numbered among the archbishops of the Church, who had received no sacred orders?"—Colgan's *Trias Thaumaturga*; *Septima Appendix ad Acta S. Patricii*, p. 301, col. 2, seq.

Such is the extraordinary account of the matter given by this most learned Roman Catholic writer. It is one, however, which will not stand examining very closely, as we shall easily prove to the reader.

(For continuation see page 149.)

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have again to apologize to several of our friends for postponing their valued communications. If our correspondents would recollect the limited space of our columns, when forwarding letters or articles, it would prevent much embarrassment and disappointment. We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, DECEMBER, 1854.

SINCE our last number appeared, an event has taken place which is full of import to the Christian world. Although we have not yet received actual intelligence of it, we may assume that on Friday, the 8th of December, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception has been decided as an article of faith in the Roman Catholic Church.

Perhaps no fact of greater importance to Christendom has taken place in our day; for it brings to a point, and it brings under our own view, the great question which so long has distracted the Christian world.

The great question has been, whether the Church of Rome has preserved unchanged the faith which Christ and his Apostles delivered to the world.

If the Church of Rome has preserved that faith unchanged, then all who differ from her must be wrong; but if the Church of Rome has *changed* that faith, then to "contend for the faith *once* delivered to the saints" is the duty of all who will follow the blessed Apostles as they followed Christ.

This great question has been argued in reference to many particulars, in respect of which it is said that the Church of Rome has *formerly* altered her faith; but these alterations are said to have taken place many centuries ago; and it is, perhaps, not easy for plain people to judge about past events with the same certainty with which they judge of the events which happen in their own day, and within their own knowledge. But now the question, whether the Church of Rome has preserved the Apostles' faith unchanged since the Apostles' days, must be argued upon a fact which is actually taking place while we write these pages.

The Council of Trent professed to deliver nothing concerning matters of faith but what had been handed down unchanged from the time of the Apostles. Speaking of the purity of the Gospel, that Council says, "seeing that this truth is contained in written books and unwritten traditions, which, being received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or delivered by the Apostles as with their own hands, at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have come down even to us. . . . Moreover, those traditions, whether pertaining to faith or morals, it (the Council) receives with equal affection of piety and reverence, and venerates, as being dictated by word of mouth, either by Christ or the Holy Spirit, and *preserved* in the Catholic Church by *continual succession.*"*

And when they come to declare their doctrine

* "Perspicuus hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis, et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt. . . . Necnon traditiones ipsas, cum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continuâ successione in Ecclesiâ Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur."—*Secs. quarta.*